

From: Porter, David

Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2002 5:21 PM

To: Hirsch, Michael; Hordesky, Sharon; Yancey, Lumumba; Bettridge, Matthew

Subject: FW: MOU Comments from VA

-----Original Message-----

From: Fedele, Eileen

Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2002 4:14 PM

To: Porter, David

Cc: Schuback, Jack; James, Pamela; Monahan-Gibson, Liz; Smith, George

Subject: MOU



Comments to
regionVA.doc (25 K..

See attached from VA

Here are my comments on the turn of a dime.

Although none of the "Other Needs" Options are ideal, Option 3 more closely identifies with current IFG operations in Commonwealth. Option 1 and 4 are most undesirable.

Page 4, Item (2)(C) & Page 5, Item (g)(3): Glad to know that FEMA will allow changes when in best interest of disaster victims. *(Based on lack of specifics in earlier documents, this was a concern for me.)*

Page 5, Item (h): Earlier documents referenced the MOU, State Administrative Plan and the State Management Plan. Since there is no reference to State Admin Plan in this document, is it correct that the State will submit only a MOU and a Management Plan?

Page 3-3, Item i): Are the performance measures based on the MOU and the State Management Plan? If not, how will these measures be developed? Does the Joint Performance Review occur at the conclusion of the disaster? Is there a new closeout package? If so, please provide a list of included items.

Page 3-6, Item e): Will FEMA continue to set-up a DFO and allow state processing "Other Needs" to co-locate when selecting Option 2 or 3? If no, the expectation is that FEMA will provide inventory of computer and telecommunications equipment at site selected by State and that this cost will not be charged against the 5% administrative cost allowance.

Attachment B: Option 3, FEMA's Role: Appeals. According to page 3-7, Item j), and page 3-9, Item c) i) (1), the responsibility belongs to the State and not to FEMA. Discrepancy needs to be clarified.